



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/672,622      | 09/26/2003  | Yoshiki Fujimura     | 0001494/2215USU     | 8062             |

7590 12/09/2008  
Charles N. J. Ruggiero, Esq.  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
10th Floor  
One Landmark Square  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

HICKS, MICHAEL J

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2165

|           |               |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

12/09/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                          |                                      |  |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/672,622 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>FUJIMURA, YOSHIKI |  |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b><br>Michael J. Hicks  | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2165                  |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael J. Hicks. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Ned McMahon. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 04 November 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Loen, Davis.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☒ was not reached.    h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed believed deficiencies in the disclosure of the mail server limitation within the rejection of Claim 1. Examiner indicated that further consideration was needed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| /Michael J. Hicks/<br>Examiner, Art Unit 2165 | /Christian P. Chace/<br>Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165 |
|---|--|